CATHOLIC ART QUARTERLY

PENTECOST 1943
VOLUME VI NUMBER 3

The President's Message 1
Participation in the Apostolate of Catholic Art 3
Art and Atheism 9
A Pentecost Hymn 11
Why Exhibit Works of Art? 13
Christian Principles in Art Teaching 18
Who's Who and What? 21
C.A.A. News 23

CATHOLIC ART ASSOCIATION

Paprat Library
of Ecclesiastical Art

C.A.A. MEMBERSHIP AND PRIVILEGES

SUSTAINING MEMBERS contribute $25 annually toward the maintenance of the Association's work, receive the CATHOLIC ART QUARTERLY, vote in all elections, and have access to the library and the exhibits.

PATRONAL MEMBERS contribute $5 annually and have the above privileges.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS (schools, clubs, etc.) as a group contribute $5 annually, send two voting delegates to conventions, have extended exhibit privileges, receive a subscription to the QUARTERLY, and may use the library and exhibits.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS contribute $2 annually, receive the QUARTERLY, have one vote in all elections, may enter work in the C.A.A. exhibits, and may use the library.

National and regional conference privileges are shared by all members. Any member approved by the Advisory Board is eligible for office in C.A.A. elections.

The Catholic Art Quarterly

VOL. VI PENTECOST 1943 No. 3

Official Bulletin of the Catholic Art Association
Published at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota,
with ecclesiastical approval.

ADVISORY BOARD

Dom Damasus Winzen, O.S.B.
Rev. Paul Hanly Furfey, Ph.D.
Sister Esther, S.P.
Lee Bowen, Ph.D.
Graham Carey

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Rev. Angelo Zankl, O.S.B., president
Frank F. Seaman, treasurer
Sister Helene, O.P., secretary

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Melville Steinfels, professional
Sister Genevieve, R.S.M., educ.

Business communications and changes of address should be sent to Sister Helene, O.P., Studio Angelico, Adrian, Michigan. Articles intended for publication should be sent to the editor, Dunstan Tucker, O.S.B., Collegeville, Minnesota. Since the *Catholic Art Quarterly* appears only four times a year and space is consequently valuable, it has been deemed advisable not to publish material that is easily accessible in secular sources unless that material is presented from a new and important angle, or is given a Catholic interpretation, and is in accord with the Catholic Art Association principles.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Dear C.A.A. Members:

AT the risk of encroaching upon the book reviewer's domain I recommend to our members two recent works which contain significant contributions to a better understanding of the purpose of all the arts. *The Crisis of our Age*" by Pitrim A. Sorokin (Dutton, N.Y., 1942) is a *must* on the *legenda* of every Catholic artist and craftsman. Enriched with extraordinary qualifications to speak on the subject of the arts, this Harvard University professor's knifelike mind presents a keen analysis of the degeneration into which the arts have fallen the past four centuries, lists the causes of the degeneration, and states the necessity of a return to the Christian *Weltanschauung* for a restoration. Had the C.A.A. not antedated this book, some of its paragraphs might have served as a worthy preamble to a CAA charter....The other significant work is a chapter called "A Digression on the Arts" in the "Catholic Pattern" by the late Thomas Woodlock (✠ April 1943) (Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1942). In the book the Catholic basic position or "pattern" of life is first outlined, then are listed the great historical apostasies and aberrations from this pattern: the apostasy from doctrine, the apostacy from metaphysics, the modern superstition of "scientism," the moral debacle, all of which have had a telling effect on the arts.

WHILE on the subject of reading about the arts, I would like to voice the hope that those of our members who are blessed with a talent for writing about the arts contribute to the Catholic Art Quarterly as generously as they do to the purely secular art journals. It must be admitted as an anomaly of the first water to have presented to us in a recent CAQ an article replete with the Christian vision by one who has been graced with the baptism of the Spirit only, while the "*Illuminati*" are enticed to add to the vapid diet of secularism in the arts.

It is with some hesitation that I herewith invite members to submit to the editor prints of the photographic art for the gallery pages of the Michaelmas issue. That photography is a legitimate art medium is beyond question, since the use of light and silver emulsion to portray is as honest and valid an art-tool as are brushes and paints, needle and thread, hammer and chisel, bow and strings. In its ability to display a virtually unlimited range of delicate tonal gradations photography surpasses all other graphic art media. But it is precisely this ease of presentation which constitutes the great pitfall inherent in photography as an art-medium, for unless we rigidly control every step, from conception to the finished print, we will reproduce merely the superficial sensory world without suggesting any transcendental values or supra-sensory realities. The great ease of giving the illusion in two dimensions of the three-dimensional factual world and saying nothing further, is the snare which not many photographers escape, and is the reason why the bulk of photographic production must be classed as mere sensate art, without lasting value. . . .So don't send that snapshot of your Aunt Minnie, with the sunbeams burnishing her tresses, if that's all it has—it isn't the kind of thing we need for the gallery pages. But if Minnie's face, lined with care and sorrow and toil, at the same time expresses sublime Christian resignation and cheerful submission to the will of God in her trials, it may prove acceptable. Only black and white prints, not smaller than 8 by 10 inches, are acceptable and should be addressed to the editor in ample time to be judged for inclusion in the Michaelmas issue.

Angelo Zankl, O.S.B.
President.

Participating In The Apostolate Of Catholic Art

By SISTER HELENE, O.P.

THERE is much the same reason for finding it awkward to write about an Apostolate to Apostles as there is for finding it difficult to talk about art to artists. And since the members of the Catholic Art Association are both artists and apostles, I can only hope to serve as a reminder for things they know very well already in order that together we may sharpen our respect for that Apostolate and deepen the Catholicity of the Arts.

Naturally, our problem is to find a method. Are we to write or are we to do? All of us would prefer to do, but for a very practical reason we must both write and do. Things have been rather badly pushed around lately by pagan systems of philosophy until today we find ourselves uncomfortable in the use of Catholic language in entirely Catholic circles. In other words, things have got out of order and we have lost the feel of our Catholic language in trying to express what is wrong. We have the extra labor, therefore, of defining and explaining before we can put things back into order.

First of all, it seems, we must reckon simply and directly with the wholeness of things and the integrity of our places as makers of things in time—whence the very Catholic chore of putting the image of man together and of restoring things to the hierarchy of their values within the pattern of creation. And this is not an easy task. While we have been inhaling secularism as if it were air, we have supposed ourselves to be happily Catholic and Christian. We ourselves have been unconscious of our secularism. In order to become aware of our position we need some contrast now and then to force us to realize how far we have unconsciously strayed from the main trend and the fine points of a truly Catholic conduct of affairs. Periodic evaluations, if they are more honest than self congratulatory, are safeguards against further digression. As Apostles, being all things to all to save all, we are pledged to the additional obligation of protecting ourselves lest we digress so far as to become castaways. The very ambition to be all things to all men sets us, as Apostles and artists, into this pattern of wholeness, and makes it imperative that we become conscious of God's design for the whole man, inasmuch as man is an integral part of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Our thinking, which we have deemed well ordered and unified in one all absorbing purpose, has become chaotic and we have learned to separate art from religion, religion from philosophy, and philosophy from science until mankind seems divided into distinct species: artists, religious men, philosophers, and scientists—as if God had not meant us to be all of them at once in varying degrees. What we need to do is to search again for unity that we may once more live the whole life God meant us to.

YOU must have attended meetings, as I have, where secular educators made stirring speeches about *Integration*, and you must have read on the Catholic faces present the fervent interior vow to go right home and start integrating. Start integrating! How blind and secularized the vision! When eyes in Catholic focus look at the Church—which is the Catholic family life in grandiose proportion—there, spread out for all to see and seeing to understand, is the real, the thorough integration, centuries old, of a religious, scholarly, and domestic plan of life. There we find *goodness* in the liturgy feeding souls, *truth* in scholarship feeding minds, and *beauty* in all those generous arts which minister to bodies.

This community pattern of the integral man in the Integral Christ contains another trilogy in body, soul, and divinity. Catholic living must serve all three and, from our point of view, Catholic art, together with preaching, teaching, and worship, is a means by which we accomplish that triple service in the fullness of life. With dignity the crafts and art beautify the services rendered to bodies. Philosophy and art serve truth and satisfy the desires of souls. Liturgy and art make evident to us the goodness of the Divinity—our Emmanuel. A second trilogy within the image of man requires that he exercise intelligence, judgment, and responsibility, singly or co-operatively, in this life of work and worship. His intellect embraces truth. His judgment embraces good. His responsibility applies truth and goodness in work toward the creation of beauty. The intelligence can then embrace beauty, judgment can conform to beauty and, through his work, man can execute it with variety and orderliness.

These relationships are simple for Catholic eyes to see. Truth and beauty are not complicated. Our minds are the complicating factor. By the time we study through a thing, as we say, minor issues seem to become major ones and we may even miss the forest while we examine the trees. Then we forget, or, being too close for perspective, ignore these simple things until an outsider or a violent contrast restores the vision to our Catholic eyes and we evaluate what is within sight. War is such an "outsider" and violent contrast all in one. It has made us take stock of our age, and the picture it frames has little comfort in it at best. (I make no apology here for straying into the field of sociology, for talk among art apostles can hardly escape living problems with art so much a part of human living as we have found it.) This is the do-as-you-please era in which the wilful and arbitrary elements of industry and capitalism have been allowed to de-Christianize, de-humanize, and de-personalize men. It is essential to the image of man that he live a human life, know human love, and do human work. As Cardinal Faulhauber so often reminds his people, we must be human to be Christian, even as Christ became human. Today one of the greatest causes of misery in our industrialized existence is aimlessness, its lack of *purpose*. Another is the wrong kind of poverty, the indigence which lacks the necessary *materials* for existence, or which has abused those materials. There is wide-spread moral and physical degeneracy where personal faculties and energies have been squandered, with the result that there is a lack of efficient means for facing existence. And, sadly enough, life, love, and work

lack a sense of *pattern* today, pattern in time and space. There we have it—the rife violation of the four basic causes by which life was intended to move splendidly, proportionately, and integrally toward an eternal goal.

A respect for purpose must replace aimlessness.

A respect for materials must restore a true philosophy of property.

A respect for efficient tools must restore bodies and minds to health.

A respect for form must re-establish patterns for living that are orderly.

And these are the same four causes which you have met repeatedly in the *Catholic Art Quarterly* and at CAA conferences. Here they apply directly to all living and, if art is to be the integral part of life that it seemed to be when we linked it with work, study, and prayer a while back, then it is obvious that our apostolate runs the whole gamut of the Catholic art of living. Through respect for purpose we, the leaders, and those we lead become saints. Through respect for materials we become worthy proprietors. Through respect for our personal efficiency through good health we become athletes. Through respect for form and a decent regard for order we become artists. *Respect* is such a Catholic word! It connotes "esteem," "deferential regard," "actual appreciation." I think it not too strong to say that respect is "reverence." We are the running heralds of these respects. They can never be self-conscious because they can never be selfish. This is the whole way. It is, simply, respectfulness: brother respects brother and man respects God's image in the image of his fellowman.

BEFORE we get too far away from these four respects, I would like to indicate their obvious fruition in rural life and their potential energy in industry. It is a goodly sight today to see that not even a global war has checked the advance being made in this country toward respectfulness. The land and craft movement has been in progress some time, quietly advancing toward this crisis as its happy counterbalance. In its several manifestations rural life is as good an argument as one can find for integral living. Combine it with the liturgy and it has about it that Catholic joyousness which has no counterpart this side of heaven. In some localities there is no need to go into the matter of land and craft relationships. It remains for us as apostles to recognize that dwellers on the land must put the arts back into the home where they originally flourished respectfully and grew out of the loving desire to make all things well for the use of the family—the family which typified God's family within the little cosmos which was the home. St. Thomas Aquinas includes in the word "use" the sense of "to enjoy," for he takes St. Augustine quite literally as saying that to use is to will to employ, and that to enjoy is to use joyfully. So the loving and joyous service of the maker of good things passes to the receiver of those things in his will to use them joyously.

For the willing and the loving discipline is easy. That is where cult comes into culture and where Christ's life grows into Christian living, which is Christian giving. That is where liturgy becomes the expression of the Mystical Body at work and at prayer, because work is prayer and prayer is no labor at all. For does not the Craftsman, the Father, work through the word, His Son,

conceived in the mind through the love of the will, which is the Spirit, for some object? This is Augustine's "touch of the Trinity" to be found in all creatures. And the Trinity must ever bring us back to unity and integrity, unity on the land and in industry.

The farmer must have established patterns and purposes. He must be artist and athlete. He manipulates soil, seed, and storm, informing them with his intelligence to the purpose he wishes to see realized. As he begins the cycles of food, clothing and shelter, he furhishes the raw materials for the corporal works of mercy. Even in charity we are not sufficient unto ourselves. What he produces for food can be further informed by the culinary artist, and then the symbolism of wheat becomes the realism of bread. Flax in the field, where he saw the beauty of its intelligently directed growth, becomes beautiful to a new set of perceptions when informed by the intelligence and skill of the weaver. This corporate quality in works of art is a quality ignored by secular selfishness, but we who talk of corporate worship must recognize it if we are to be consistent. It is the antidote for egocentric artiness.

While I point to such joyous things on the land, I do not mean to exclude the potential goodness to be found in cities and factories. Granted that wilful and arbitrary capitalism has materialistic goals which leave nothing for individuals but aimlessness, yet with the war have come sudden forces of patriotism which give capitalism new goals and, better still, put new energies into the de-personalized worker. Factories today can do things they never accomplished before because there is a true and just purpose for work. Industrialism has a purpose now, bigger than itself. Despite all the struggles of labor and trade unions, the admission is slowly being made that factories need not be monsters devouring men. Workers are more frequently recognized as persons. Their health and living conditions are allowed to enter into the scheme of things. More people have learned to use their hands and heads simultaneously, and, supreme test of advance, resourcefulness is winning E's. And while pattern has been difficult to form in this sudden flux and turn-over in social conditions, there is every indication that it will follow. People who yesterday would have dodged work with soft excuses today are now seeking work to balance their consciences against the times by seeking useful employment. There are new respects at work. Some people call them reverently the four freedoms.

We can continue to call them the four causes.

Here again in factories and cities we find corporate work, and here, as elsewhere, the image of man must remain intact—a being who respects and is respected. With the recognition of common purposes, shared homes and shared transportation facilities, mutual health problems, and a common timetable for the pattern of work and rest, new bonds are growing between people. And, though the conscious recognition of their essential unity in Christ may be lacking to most, nevertheless it is there.

Today the cry everywhere is: "what can I do? What part can I take in the present crisis?" To admit the part is to imply the whole. Artists and art teachers have not been slow to integrate themselves and their works within the crisis.

Yet from the literature on the subject which has come to my notice, it would seem that we have been given only the most superficial answer to our questions. We are told that the government wants map-makers, draftsmen, industrial designers, model-makers and poster designers. Advertisers tell us that it is patriotic to teach cartooning if we use such-and-such ink, and that it is practical to make camouflaged model cities with so-and-so's paste. In fact the illusion develops finally that if we but brush up on mechanical drawing and drag a class one lesson behind us for a few months we can all go forth and get $80 per week and up. Few think about the value of the work itself but only about the pay. I have seen schools bend over backwards getting posters ready for a scrap drive. They felt entirely complacent about being practical, yet for all the honest educational or art value that their execution had meant to the student, the posters belonged IN the scrap heap rather than ON it.

It is not the intention of the workers that I question here; it is rather the amount of attention paid to production when under the circumstances attention ought really to be devoted to the development of qualities and working habits which should outlast the postermaking or any other kind of making. We can unconsciously make the product the whole goal when keeping up with the neighbors—who have not investigated their purposes either.

ONLY last month, when asked this what-can-we-do? question by an assembly of Catholic college students, Archbishop Mooney answered in substance that they should continue to do what they were doing—be alert students—but be so more thoroughly for the future. It seems an answer fit for artists as well as for students. We already have complicated programs. Let us not add to them in order to be better artists. We can deepen the stream instead. Craftsmanship needs a chance to sink in. No one is going to ask why Catholic artists have not perfected the latest techniques, but everyone *does* ask why Catholic artists are not so thorough as their craftsmanly forebears. At any rate, it is not going to matter much what subject-matter the war artists handle. But resourcefulness and adaptability will matter. If we can keep our balance against the tide of suggestions being made to us by the superficial, we can be practical in an enduring way. As art apostles we cannot afford to be taken in by the sentimental blurbs that parade as war efforts. It is enough that the newspapers and movies glut existence with war sensationalism. When people turn from them they look to the arts for stable permanent things and a spiritualizing courage.

In no way does this imply that the artist can be or become an isolationist. His is an active mission. He must be the eyes of those who do not see. He must deliver messages. He must be giving constantly, but he also must receive. So, it is within the apostolic tradition that he go apart and rest a little. At times he must pause to evaluate his work, contrast it with secular standards or pause to replenish his spirit the while he is developing his skills. For the work of evaluation we have art conferences. For the development of skills art centers and art schools.

After establishing all the intimate relationships with art that we have found in work, study, and worship, I am compelled to point out one false note in the melody and let you blame whom you must. Art is our Catholic vesture, yet in general practice we are tailored in un-Catholic shops and fool ourselves into thinking that we have custom-made art educations that fit. As Catholic artists we must face the fact that to be consistent a Catholic environment is the proper one in which to nurture Catholic arts. Can we work theocentrically when we have been egocentrically trained? Are we so blinded by secular values that we must seek out blind leaders? I realize these questions touch raw spots, but I would not be honest if I failed to ask them. On the other hand, you have every right to object that you must go to secular sources for advanced training because Catholic insititutions of higher learning do not offer the training you need. The circle becomes vicious if we go another step and admit that when Catholic institutions are ready to meet our needs then we will have to man our art departments from our own ranks, or people them with those who have come through the same un-Catholic system of training. Unless we pull out from under secular standards now and be apostolic in preparedness as well as in the practice of the Catholic arts, we will find ourselves in the end only aping the secular system under the veneer of a Catholic name.

By an entirely Catholic environment for the nurturing of Catholic art we would make it easy for the Church to use art as she uses preaching, teaching, and worship for the spread of the glad tidings of redemption to all men, that she may save all. We would then have some chance to respect the eucharistic character of art and reverence our apostolate. We would live *proportionately*—filling our proper place in life as it is related to the entire Mystical Body. As Catholic devotees of beauty we would be *integral* men at last treating purposes as saints treat them; materials as wise proprietors treat them; caring for health as does the athlete and, finally, developing pattern as does the the artist. We would then enjoy that glow of *splendor* which, though not seen upon us by men would have clung to us from our preview of that Beauty which is God.

If we care for fine verses, how much more for a noble life?''

The Age of Raphael and Michelangelo was in a decadence and its excellence is technical. Everything after Giotto is decadent in form, though advancing in execution.—Gerard Manely Hopkins.

Art And Atheism

By GRAHAM CAREY

SOMEWHERE the great St. Augustine has written words more or less to this effect.

Mankind deals with beings on three levels: those below him, those above him, and those on the same level as himself. To the beings on each of these levels he has a specific relationship and a specific duty. To those creatures below him his relationship is one of superiority or mastery, and it is his duty to use and not abuse them. To those beside him his relationship is one of equality or brotherhood, and his duty to his fellow man is one of neighborly service. To God, and to whatever othersuper human beings there may be, man's relation is one of inferiority, and his duty is worship and obedience.

All this seems certain, and so obivious that it is not easy to state it in an interesting manner. But let us consider another truth, this one formulated by the psychologists.

The impulses of the human being are, like those of the lower animals, of two general types, more or less complementary to one another. They are either dominant or submissive. They have a sort of reciprocal action, to understand which is also to understand how normal and right the dominant impulses are. In themselves there is nothing of the Fall about them. We are created with certain emotional as well as physical needs, and among these is the need to impose oneself, or a part of oneself, upon objects around us. Normal man has a positive need to impose patterns, or arrangements, or ideas, or forms upon the materials with which he is concerned. To be worthy of his human status he must, of course, impose forms upon matter for a worthy end, and here he is guided by his intelligence and fortified by his will. To be an imposer of forms without this guidance and fortification, is to be an art-for-art saker.

The imposition of forms upon matter for a legitimate end is by definition the activity of art.

Man's relationship to the world of creatures inferior to him is therefore that of artist to his material. His duty is to use it as it should be used according to its nature. His dominant impulses, guided by intelligence and will, make all his normal every-day activities artistic. Whether he is a painter of images or a painter of houses, whether he is a maker of music or a maker of moccasins, he is an artist if he develops and imposes patterns upon his material for sufficient reasons.

Some of the arts—notably those of the mother, the physician and the farmer—are essentially co-operative, concerned with the imposition of patterns already determined by the laws of living things, and such co-operative arts are of especial importance and dignity. But all information of materials by man is essentially artistic, and is the normal and natural way of exercising his God-given dominant impulses.

Industrialism, however, has deprived a large portion of people of the status of artist. It has deprived the artist of the opportunity of making anything

useful. It has reduced many to a sub-human condition of intellectual irresponsibility. What is the effect of this deprivation of a natural birth-right?

The dispossessed still has his dominant impulses, but he no longer has the normal means of satisfying them. There are still three levels of beings—above, below and beside him—with which he can deal. There would seem to be only three things which could happen.

The dominant impulses might atrophy and disappear with the disappearance of their proper object. In logic this might happen, but in fact it does not.

Or the impulses might be released in a lateral direction, and people begin to try to dominate one another. This does happen, and it is the most common solution of the difficulty. It is but too well known to students of psychology that the easiest way for the frustrated person to feel at peace with himself is to push someone else down. So self-assertion and tyranny—petty or world-wide—tend to take the place of brotherly love, and the service due to the neighbor.

It is interesting to notice here that a common cure for those whose frustrated state of mind has brought them near to mental collapse is what is called "occupational therapy." It consists in the making of things, the exercise of simple arts, the satisfaction in the performance of which has a salutary effect upon the disordered nervous system. For therapeutic purposes the doctor gives back to his patient a little of what all members of a healthy society normally enjoy.

BUT a still further result, happily less common than mere social maladjustment, sometimes follows artistic dispossession. Some souls are so embittered that their dominant impulses are actually released upward, and they try to dominate God.

True atheism is probably very rare. I am not referring to agnosticism, skepticism or anti clericalism, but to the real hatred of the idea of God. This seems usually to be found among people who have lived under extremes of industrial tyranny. If one is deprived of the normal mastery over lower creatures, and also of dominance over one's fellow men, what is there left to dominate but what is higher? And how can a man hope to dominate God except by denying Him? For to admit His existence is necessarily to admit the impossibility of dominating and the duty of worshipping Him.

These lines are written in the hope that they will help the reader to a broader concept of art. We are usually taught to think of art as the production only of a certain kind of rather frivolous or unnecessary things. We are encouraged to think of it as the provision of distractions from weariness and pain, rather than as the provision of primary necessities. But this is a distorted point of view. As rational human beings we all have an inherited right to be artists. In the cases of untold millions this right has been denied by our present financial and economic system. That is not a frivolous or secondary matter, but a serious and primary one. The greatest commandment is that we shall love and serve our neighbor and love and serve our Creator. Industrialism has brought about a situation where it becomes increasingly difficult not to hate our neighbor, and where some are driven even to hate their God.

A Pentecost Hymn

By LEE BOWEN

JUST as Christmas and Easter are respectively the feasts of midnight and sunrise, so Pentecost, together with Ascension day, is a feast of noon—the triumphant "Sun" gone up on high to create and rule the Universal Church though the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit. It is quite natural that the Pentecost hymns, celebrating the establishment of the Church as the guardian of truth, should be replete with doctrine and paraphrastic references to Scripture.

Sometimes the dogmas and ecclesiastical teachings are stated specifically and sometimes they are indirectly mentioned by allegory. Many examples might be cited. For instance, mediaeval hymns frequently declared that at the first Whitsunday the Holy Spirit was sent not only by the Father but also by the Son. The same hymns assumed it would be generally understood that because the Jewish Pentecost was allegorical of the Christian Pentecost, and came fifty days after the Passover, the symbol of Easter, the Descent of the Holy Spirit was destined to come fifty days after the resurrection. So the symbolism of numbers was introduced.

The Holy Spirit was thought to have come on the apostles on the fiftieth day after Easter because it was the "perfect day," that is the first day after the forty-ninth, which is seven times seven, signifying all the days and acts of creation redeemed by the seven outpourings of Christ's blood. From the creation and the redemption came the power of the Church breathed upon by the Spirit of God. Not only did the Holy Spirit descend on the fiftieth day after Easter but also on the third hour of that day. The third hour signified the unity of action by the Triune God in creating the Church.

The mediaevals took it as inevitable that the Holy Ghost should have descended with the sound of a rushing wind and in the form of fire. There are several passages in the *Old Testament* in which the wind was taken to symbolize the breath or "inspiration" of God. As one example, the "Lord answered Job out of a whirlwind" [*Job*, XXXVIII, 1]. With the sound "as of a mighty wind" there came also tongues of fire. Fire, said Rabanus Maurus, is the Holy Spirit, the burning love of God. Jeremias described the scorching flame of charity when he said there "came in my heart as a burning fire, shut up in my bones, and I was wearied, not being able to bear it." Fire as also signifying the Church is indicated in St. Luke, where Christ is quoted as saying, "I am come to cast fire on the earth."

IN the hymns for Pentecost, besides the language of symbolism, there is also very often a description of the Pentecost events as narrated in *The Acts of the Apostles*. The men of Judea accused the apostles of being drunk, but Peter stood up and said it was a fulfillment of the prophecy made by Joel, "And it shall come to pass after this, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and

your sons and your daughters shall prophesy: your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions" [II, 28].

There is a fourth century hymn used throughout the middle ages which contains all the literary symbolism and the scriptural references explained above. It is quoted below according to the translation made by J. M. Neale, G. H. Palmer, and J. W. Doran.

Now Christ, ascending whence He came,
Had mounted o'er the starry frame,
The Holy Ghost on man below,
The Father's promise to bestow.

The solemn time was drawing nigh,
Replete with heav'nly mystery,
On seven days' sevenfold circles borne,
That first and blessed Whitsunmorn.

When the third hour shone all around,
There came a rushing mighty sound,
And told the Apostles, while in prayer,
That, as was promised, God was there.

Forth from the Father's light it came,
That beautiful and kindly flame:
To fill with fervor of His word
The spirits faithful to their Lord.

With joy the Apostles' breasts are fired,
By God the Holy Ghost inspire:
And straight, in divers kinds of speech,
The wondrous works of God they preach.

To men of every race they speak,
Alike Barbarian, Roman, Greek:
From the same lips, with awe and fear
All men their native accents hear.

But Juda's sons, e'en faithless yet
With mad infuriate rage beset,
To mock Christ's followers combine,
As drunken all with new-made wine.

When lo! with signs and mighty deeds,
Stands Peter in the midst, and pleads;
Confounding their malignant lie
By Joel's ancient prophecy.

To God the father let us sing,
To God the son, our risen King,
And equally let us adore
The Spirit, God forevermore.

Why Exhibit Works Of Art

By ANANDA COOMARASWAMY

WHAT IS AN Art Museum for? As the word "Curator" implies, the most essential function of such a Museum is to take care of works of art which are no longer in their original places or no longer used as was originally intended, and are therefore in danger of destruction. This care of works of art does not necessarily involve their exhibition.

If we ask, why should the protected works of art be exhibited to the public, the answer will be made, that this is to be done with an educational purpose. But before we ask, Education in or for what? a distinction must be made between the exhibition of the works of living artists and that of ancient or relatively ancient or exotic works of art. It is unnecessary for Museums to exhibit the works of living artists which are not in imminent danger of destruction; or at least, if such works are exhibited, it should be clearly understood that the Museum is really advertising the artist and acting on behalf of the art dealer whose business it is to find a market for the artist; the only difference being that it makes no profit. On the other hand, that a living artist should wish to be "hung" or "shown" in a Museum can be only due to his need or his vanity. For things are made normally for certain purposes and certain places to which they are appropriate, and not simply "for exhibition"; and whatever is thus made by an artist for a consumer is controlled by certain requirements. Whereas, as Mr. Steinfels has recently remarked, "Art which is only intended to be hung on the walls of a Museum is one kind of art that need not consider its relationship to its ultimate surroundings. The artist can paint anything he wishes, any way he wishes, and if the Curators and Trustees like it well enough they will line it up on the wall with all the other curiosities."

We are left with the real problem, Why exhibit? as it applies to the relatively ancient or foreign works of art which, because of their fragility and because they no longer correspond to any needs of our own of which we are actively conscious, are preserved in our Museums. If we are to exhibit these objects for educational reasons, and not as mere curios, it is evident that we are proposing to make such use of them as is possible without an actual handling. It will be imaginatively and not actually that we must use the mediaeval reliquary, or lie on the Egyptian bed. The educational ends that an exhibition can serve demand, accordingly, the services not of a Curator only, but of a Docent who explains the original patron's needs and the original artist's methods; for it is because of what these patrons and artists were that the works before us are what they are. If the exhibition is to be anything more than a show of curiosities it will not suffice to be satisfied with our own reactions to the objects; to know why they are what they are we must know the men that made them. It will not be "educational" to assume that these men thought of art in our fashion, or that they had aesthetic motives, or were "expressing

themselves." We must examine *their* theory of art, first of all in order to understand the things that they made by art, and secondly in order to ask whether their view of art, if it differ from ours, may not have been a truer one.

LET US ASSUME that we are considering an exhibition of Greek objects, and call upon Plato to act as our Docent. He knows nothing of our distinction of fine from applied arts. For him painting and agriculture, music and carpentry and pottery are all equally kinds of poetry or making. And as Plotinus, following Plato, tells us, the arts such as music and carpentry are not based on human wisdom, but on the thinking "there."

Whenever Plato speaks disparagingly of the "base mechanical arts" and of mere "labour" as distinguished from the "fine work" of making things, it is with reference to kinds of manufacture that provide for the needs of the body alone. The kind of art that he calls wholesome and will admit to his ideal state must be not only useful but also true to rightly chosen models and therefore beautiful, and this art, he says, will provide at the same time for the souls and bodies of your citizens. His "music" stands for all that we mean by *culture*, and his "gymnastics" for all that we mean by physical training and well-being; he insists that these ends of culture and physique must never be separately pursued; the tender artist and the brutal athlete are equally contemptible. We, on the other hand, are accustomed to think of music, and culture in general, as useless, but still valuable. We forget that music, traditionally, is never something only for the ear, but always the accompaniment of some kind of action. Our own conceptions of culture are typically negative. I believe that Professor Dewey is right in calling our cultural values snobbish. The lessons of the Museum must be applied to our life.

Because we are not going to handle the exhibited objects, we shall take their aptitude for use for granted, and rather ask in what sense they are also true or significant; for if these objects can no longer serve our bodily needs, perhaps they can still serve those of our soul, or if you prefer the word, our reason. What Plato means by "true" is "inconographically correct." For all the arts, without exception, are representations of a model; which does not mean that they are such as to tell us what the model looks like, which would be impossible seeing that the forms of traditional art are typically imitative of invisible things, but that they are such adequate analogies as to be able to remind us, i.e., put us in mind again, of their archetypes. Works of art are reminders; in other words, supports of contemplation. Now since the contemplation and understanding of these works is to serve the needs of the soul, that is to say in Plato's own words, to attune our own distorted modes of thought to cosmic harmonies, "so that by an assimilation of the knower to the to-be-known, the archetypal nature, and coming to be in that likeness, we may attain at last to a part in the *life's best* that has been appointed by the Gods to man for this time being and hereafter," or stated in Indian terms, to effect our own metrical reintegration through the imitation of divine forms; and because, as the Upanishad reminds us, "one comes to be of just such stuff as that on which the mind is set," it follows that it is not only requisite that the

forms of art should be adequate reminders of their paradigms, but that the nature of these paradigms themselves must be of the utmost importance, if we are thinking of a cultural value of art in any serious sense of the word *culture*." The *what* of art is far more important than the *how;* it should, indeed, be the WHAT that determine the how, as form determines shape.

PLATO has always in view the representation of invisible and intelligible forms. The imitation of anything and everything is despicable; it is the actions of Gods and Heroes, not the artist's feelings or the natures of men who are all too human like himself, that are the legitimate theme of art. If a poet cannot imitate the eternal realities, but only the vagaries of human character, there can be no place for him in an ideal society, however true or intriguing his presentations may be. The Assyriologist Andrae is speaking in perfect accord with Plato when he says, in connection with pottery, that "It is the business of art to grasp the primordial truth, to make the inaudible audible, to enunciate the primordial word, to reproduce the primordial images—or it is not art." In other words, a real art is one of symbolic and significant representation; a representation of things that cannot be seen except by the intellect. In this sense art is the antithesis of what we mean by visual education, for this has in view to tell us what things that we do not see, but might see, look like. It is the natural instinct of a child to work from within outwards; "First I think, and then I draw my think." What wasted efforts we make to teach the child to stop thinking, and only to observe. Instead of training the child to think, and how to think and of what, we make him 'correct' his drawing by what he sees. It is clear that the Museum at its best must be the sworn enemy of the methods of instruction currently prevailing in our School of Art.

It was anything but "the Greek miracle" in art that Plato admired; what he praised was the canonical art of Egypt in which "these modes (of representation) that are by nature correct had been held for ever sacred." The point of view is identical with that of the Scholastic philosophers, for whom "art has fixed ends and ascertained means of operation." New songs, yes; but never new kinds of music, for these may destroy our whole civilization. It is the irrational impulses that yearn for innovation. Our sentimental or aesthetic culture—sentimental, aesthetic and materialistic are virtually synonyms—prefers instinctive expression to the formal beauty of rational art. But Plato could not have seen any difference between the mathematician thrilled by a "beautiful equation" and the artist thrilled by his formal vision. For he asks us to stand like men against our instinctive reactions to what is pleasant or unpleasant, and to admire in works of art, not their aesthetic surfaces but the logic or right reason of their composition. And so naturally he points out that "The beauty of the straight line and the circle, and the plane and the solid figures formed from these ...is not, like other things, relative, but always absolutely beautiful." Taken together with all that he has to say elsewhere of the humanistic art that was coming into fashion in his own time and with what he has to say of Egyptian art, this amounts to an endorsement of Greek Archaic and Greek Geometric Art—the arts that really correspond to

the content of those myths and fairy tales that he held in such high respect and so often quotes. Translated into more familiar terms, this means that from this intellectual point of view the art of the American Indian sand painting is superior in kind to any painting that has been done in Europe or white America within the last several centuries. As the director of one of the five greatest museums in America has more than once remarked to me, "From the Stone Age until now, what a decline!" He meant, of course, a decline in intellectuality, not in comfort. It should be one of the functions of a well organized museum exhibition to deflate the illusion of progress.

AT THIS POINT I must digress to correct a widespread confusion. There exists a general impression that modern abstract art is in some way like and related to, or even inspired by the formality of primitive art. The likeness is altogether superficial. Our abstraction is nothing but a mannerism. Neolithic art is abstract, or rather alegbraic, because it is only an algebraic form that can be the single form of very different things. The forms of early Greek are what they are because it is only in such forms that the polar balance of physical and metaphysical can be mantained. "To have forgotten," as Bernheimer recently said, "this purpose before the mirage of absolute patterns and designs is perhaps the fundamental fallacy of the abstract movement in art." The modern abstractionist forgets that the Neolithic formalist was not an interior decorator, but a metaphysical man who saw life whole and had to *live* by his wits; one who did not, as we seek to, live by bread alone, for as the anthropologists assure us, primitive cultures provided for the needs of the soul and the body at one and the same time. The Museum exhibition should amount to an exhibition to return to these savage levels of culture.

A natural effect of the Museum exhibition will be to lead the public to enquire why it is that objects of "museum quality" are to be found only in Museums, and are not in daily use and readily obtainable. For the Museum objects, on the whole, were not originally "treasures" made to be seen in glass cases, but rather common objects of the market place that could have been bought and used by anyone. The only possible answer will again reveal the essential opposition of the Museum to the world. For this answer will be that the Museum objects were made for use, while the things that are made in our factories are made primarily for sale. The word "manufacturer" itself, meaning one who make things by hand, has come to mean a salesman who gets things made for him by machinery. The Museum objects were humanly made by responsible men, for whom their means of livelihood was a vocation and a profession. The museum objects were made by free men. Have those in our department stores been made by free men? Let us not take the answer for granted.

When Plato lays it down that the arts shall "care for the bodies and souls of your citizens," and that only things that are sane and free, and not any shameful things unbecoming free men, are to be made, it is as much as to say that the artist in whatever material must be a free man; not meaning thereby an "emancipated artist" in the vulgar sense of one having no obligation of commitment of any kind, but a man emancipated from the despotism of the

salesman. If the artist is to represent the eternal realities, he must have known them as they are. In other words, an act of the imagination in which the idea to be represented is first clothed in an inimitable form must have preceeded the operation in which this form is to be embodied in the actual material. The first of these acts is called "free" the latter "servile." But it is only if the first be omitted that the word servile acquires a dishonorable connotation. It hardly needs demonstration that our methods of manufacture are, in this shameful sense, servile, or that the industrial system, for which these methods are indispensable, is unfit for free men. A system of quantity production dominated by money values presupposes that there shall be two different kinds of makers, privileged "artists" who may be "inspired," and under-privileged labourers, unimaginative by hypothesis, since they are asked only to make what other men have imagined. As Eric Gill put it, "On the one hand we have the artist concerned solely to express himself; on the other is the workman deprived of any self to express." It has often been claimed that the productions of "fine" art are useless; it would seem to be a mockery to speak of a society as free, where it is only the makers of useless things that can be called free, except in the sense that we are all free to work or starve.

I don't believe in genius one bit, nor anything else abnormal. I want the commonplace. Genius is the inevitable nemesis of universal stupidity.

If genius will give itself to the world, well and good, but modern genius is often a thing of commercial value. Don't think I don't appreciate Pheidias, and Michel Angelo, and Blake, but those were more or less ordinary people in their day. Nowadays genius seems to mean differing from the masses. All this applies as well to "leaders." If we are anxious about civilization, it will find its leaders; if we think only about leaders, they gravitate to palaces. What has genius or a leader done for the people who farm the fields and the dwellers in the big towns? Of what good is a bottle of Imperial Tokay in a waterless city? Like David with his precious water I think one should "offer it up" and take the common chance....—H. R. Lethaby.

Christian Principles In Art Teaching

By LEONARD McLEAN FEE, S.M.

A NUMBER of years ago while attending theological courses at an international, pontifical university which nestles in the clear, serene atmosphere of the Bernese-Oberland Alps, I and hundreds of other seminarians of every nationality used to frequent the Chapel of St. Peter Canisius in the Collegiate Church of St. Michel. As I look back on those happy days the most vivid memory I retain is that of the picture of St. Peter which hung over the altar enshrining his relics. The creation of an obscure artist (at least I never learned his name), it showed the Saint in his black cloak, kneeling, his hands down at his sides with palms upturned towards the vision of the Blessed Mother on which his eyes were fixed in rapture. This picture portrayed for the hundreds of ardent, zealous neo-sacerdotes the complete surrender of the Saint to a cause, and breathed the assurance of his success. This was the message it carried to most of us, for I was curious and went to the trouble of asking some of my companions their reaction to the picture. Frenchmen, Spaniards, Irishmen, Germans, Japanese, Indians, Dutch —all had caught the same inspiration in one form or another, and going forth from that holy place as priests we have always before our minds the picture of the mighty apostle who catechized thousands into the very kingdom of God. Each one of us has been influenced in his own apostolic life by that picture portraying St. Peter Canisius' surrender to God and his utter confidence in Mary—our ideal. The artist had achieved his purpose; for as Jean de Menasce says: "Whereas the profane artist arouses the imagination, the Christian artist awakens love..." and quickens the desire to do and to achieve noble deeds.

I believe that as teachers interested in the teaching of art we ought to dust off from time to time those ideals with which we began so that they may continue to guide our way, and so that the convictions derived therefrom may encourage us in the face of the manifold difficulties confronting us in the correct teaching of art. At the same time we should check over our practical application of the fundamental principles of Christian life to our work, for if we wish to be real artists or worthy teachers of art we must first complete the preliminary task of becoming good and true ourselves. If we strive for this first, then the goodness and truth of our own being will be mirrored in our work and will radiate from it as the splendor of truth. Our work, our teaching, will be the reflection of genuine solid and sincere Christian living.

THIS sincerity of purpose, however, must be founded on a deep spirit of faith. "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus." This is the dominant note in the life of the worthy teacher, and the closer we come to the realization of this ideal the more certainly will our lives reflect that honesty, simplicity, and straightforwardness, which is the mark of a soul which finds its strength in the unity of purpose and the concentration of efforts with which it is permeated. Given

a character activated by such principles there will be no room for pretense or show, "...no vain attempting of a creature created for the spiritual to satisfy itself by burrowing into the sensible only to destroy both itself and the sensible world with which it has fallen in love." For such a person should he be given the grace to see things in a different light, the words of Augustine are applicable: "O beauty, beauty forever ancient and forever new. Behold I sought thee in far distant lands and all the while thou wert within."

These principles of right living will serve as guides in the right judging of art and in the right making of works of art. For the realization of our purpose in life aids us in knowing how to love right and, in the same way, the knowing of the purpose of things we make enables us to make them right—which is art. For art is ordered, proportioned and related to a sphere of making, and the mark of a good artist is that he turns out a good work. The modest craftsman who does his work well is an artist; the great genius whose works live on and are admired by posterity is an artist. There is no difference in principle; there is only a difference in degree. Both make things well, and this is art in the true Christian sense.

Here we may see the religious implications of art. Since man is the intellectual image of God, he must imitate God's ways. God labored and saw that all He did was good. Man is necessarily obliged to follow this Divine Exemplar. This is one of the fundamental principles of Christian living and has an immediate application in the teaching of art. Man's happiness is not found in his leisure but in his work, in the finished product of his labor. Have we not the duty to help our students realize this principle? How many of the students confided to us actually believe themselves most happy when occupied with their work? Am I a morbid pessimist in saying that the average youth has so far strayed from the true conception of this principle that he seeks only leisure, and that his ingenuity is often displayed only in shirking his work, or in rushing carelessly through it in order to have time to waste? Can we not, by means of our art courses, bring home to our students in a most striking way the pleasure and joy of work well done?

The counterfeit bill bears the mark of the particular expert who made it, as perfectly as the full note of the singer evidences his skill. The products of the carpenter, the mason, and the lawyer all tell the intimate story of their authors, just as the universe tells the story of God. In other words, there is in the dim mirror of created being a symbolical representation of the Source of all being. The law of increase and multiply is not confined solely to physical reproduction. Creative genius is found in all of the children of Adam. From the little tot, just turned half-past-three, whose response to his Mother's, "What are you drawing, Jackie?" was: "I just finished drawing God"—to the young artist receiving a prize for a ceramic, all have the thrill of knowing that they have produced something. Here, then, is one of the splendid opportunities in art—developing that sense of satisfaction in something personally well done. This thoroughness in doing things well is one of the finest results of a good art course, for it has unlimited transfer-value into practically every life situation.

Again, while discussing the religious element in art, it might be well to emphasize another principle brought forward in a striking way by Sister Augusta, S.C.,

whom I have taken the liberty to quote at length.

"The greatest beauty in the teaching art and the forming of artistic judgment is the unconscious fostering of moral judgments in our pupils. . . . A lack of this right judgment has been only too manifest in some periods of history, and in our own day disregard of honesty in art is manifest even in much of our religious art. We wonder whether this is an outgrowth of man's perverse tendency to deceive, or merely a weakness carried over from childhood to pretend, or if it is evidence of our lack of appreciation of genuineness. It is based perhaps on the argument: we can not get the finest things, so we will substitute a cheaper and try to make it look fine on the surface. As we do not want to take the trouble to do a good piece of work, we do easy things and fix them up to try to look genuine on the surface. But the effect on one's moral judgment is obvious in such a manner of working, or in any willingness to accept the pretense for the real. We are only too well acquainted with these false principles in the world about us, whether we consider dictators or our own private tendencies to appear to be something more than we are.

"From our own experience we appreciate the fundamental wrongness of such tendencies, but we do realize the vicious circle created by surrounding ourselves with false art—false marble which is really only pine board; false wood carving which is only plaster hardened into shape; false leather which is woven material painted to look like something it is not. . . . We are not conscious that these falsities about us dull our sensitiveness to truth in other matters, and so we pass them on to the children we teach. Let us think honestly and conscientiously about this and then let us consider what effect it would have on our characters to be surrounded only by genuine art."

Finally, the teaching of art according to Christian principles develops careful thinking and allows a natural freedom to the imagination. Our youth will then learn the ennobling force of an intelligent appreciation of art—which is the reflection of the Infinite Artisan. It will learn above all to appreciate beauty, whether that beauty be found in nature, in human works of art, in human character, in the majestic liturgy of the Church, or in the ideally beautiful Christ.

As Father Farrell so characteristically writes in the *Companion to the Summa:* "Perhaps one of the saving graces of our age is the fact that we have begun to bring beauty back into the everyday life of man. Kitchens, bathrooms, peeling knives, face cloths are recognized as capable of attractiveness as well as of utility. Perhaps we are beginning to imagine that we belong to an age that is in love with beauty—however, only a superficial observer could fail to see that we are robbing man of his capacity for appreciating the beautiful, blinding him to the sources of beauty, depriving him of his greatest beauty. There is a significance in the design of our streamlined locomotives, a significance that is made startlingly clear as one sees them slide beneath the huge buildings that now serve as railroad terminals, as an insect scuttles beneath a rock to escape the healthy light and air of a spring day."

It is Christian art which brings to us the full realization of genuine beauty. There is a spark of this spiritual beauty in every soul confided to our care; it is a tiny spark in comparison with the infinite fire of supreme beauty, the Sun of Justice. The more the Truth and Goodness which is God is reflected in our lives and in our work the more will the

beauty of eternal charity shine forth in our lives. Truly then the heart of the sincerely Christian artist must needs be buried in the Heart of Christ. He must be enfolded and nourished in the warm womb of grace, and in his veins must run the life-blood of charity. Only then will his work be forceful; only then will it be holy; for he lives in and by Christ, the Strong, the Holy. Then only will his work have the power of carrying a message—of awakening love and quickening the desire to make everything well so as to merit one day the "well done, good and faithful Servant" of the Divine Artisan.

WHO'S WHO AND WHAT?

ONE of the objects of the Catholic Art Association, though never stated quite so baldly, is to bring art theory and discussion within the range of common-sense language. There was in the past century altogether too much mystery in art discussion and criticism, the fashion of writing having fairly well killed the practical word, together with the idea that art has much to do with real life. It is to the credit of the CAA, therefore, that in spite of a bad tradition it has aimed consistently at the statement of art aims in plain language.

That some have thought this language too plain is apparent to anyone who belongs to the CAA. An opinion has sprung up on the side that the CAA is not entirely in accord with the best traditions of the past, that it does not aim at the creation of an art of beauty, that it has adopted too easily the language and outlook of the craftsman rather than that of the artist. It would be an exaggeration, however, to say that this impression is widespread. On the several occasions the writer was present at CAA regional meetings he was astounded at the intense loyalty of CAA members to the basic CAA doctrine. On the whole the members of the CAA are realists who are much more concerned with the advancement and the rebirth of Catholic art than with mere philosophizing.

Some years ago Kurt Reinhardt of the University of Southern California wrote: "Beauty has the strange quality that it is never attained when it is sought for." And again: "He who is after beauty as an end in itself, he who strives for beauty for beauty's sake, or after art for art's sake, such an artist will never be able to make a beautiful thing out of his life or out of his work....He has sinned against the true order of values." We need not explain to CAA readers why this is so. Let it suffice to say that the CAA teacher of art is sufficiently well acquainted with the grotesque effects which result when anyone tries to "create beauty" rather than useful things which are beautiful. Skill is one of the first requirements for genuine art, but there must be much more; art objects must satisfy needs.

The CAA commenced as an educational effort, and its work during its first five years has been largely a battle against the art superstitions of the past century. Most members of the CAA have learned the basic philosophy of the CAA well; and yet it is interesting to note how difficult it has been to show the falsity of those beliefs and opinions which had accumulated, and as they accumulated

gathered authority, until people who professed to know something about art finally ceased to think for themselves. In time, most of the art superstitions will disappear, but the day is still distant when people will cease to accept unqualifiedly such statements as the following: "the artist is born, not made," "to be an artist one must be born a genius;" "an artist is a person with an extraordinary inborn sensitivity to beauty;" "inspiration comes, it is not worked for;" "unless an art is like that of Raphael and Michelangelo, or equal to it, it is not in the best Catholic tradition."

THAT the CAA is winning its battle for a Catholic—and American—art is apparent from the many CAA workshops we see springing up, and especially from the resolution made in recent regional meetings to promote the study of art in our grade and high schools. This resolution is definitely a step forward. Our Catholic art teachers have been handicapped in the past by what in athletics we call "good material." For while they have been doing the best they could with the quality of student they worked with, even talent, unless it has been exercised from early years onward, is found to be inadequate to meet the ends the CAA aims at—a Catholic art produced by Catholic artists. The lack of early training is only too apparent. Manual skills can be taught at any age, but nothing can take the place of that simultaneous development of the eye and the imagination which comes from early efforts at creative work with tools and materials. Artists do not spring into being spontaneously; they are the product of honest labor, plus a talent that must be trained and pushed and encouraged.

For a rebirth of Catholic Art, therefore, our Catholic educators must awaken to the need of proper and early art training. With the exception of perhaps three or four schools (and they have been doing splendid work), our colleges have not entered heartily into a Catholic art program, or considered art study an integral part of a good education. It is one of the anomalies of our time that the Catholic school, though it is the teaching organ of a church which has ever been the patron of art, has lost sight of the need of art in education. The neglect of art in our grade schools, high schools and colleges is but one manifestation of our blindness and "modernness"—our aping. We no longer demand even good penmanship! Art is for the slow students! If it were not tragical it would be amusing to note how one of the highest human activities has been given over by our educators to those who are mentally deficient or who do not care to study. "Bright students" are directed into green pastures: science, philosophy and literature to the exclusion of the arts, whereas the dumbbells are guided to fields where, apparently, brains are considered unnecessary—the arts and the crafts.

The CAA was once devoted, by title, to the social studies as well as to the arts. That was because the art problem is essentially a social problem, for behind the neglect of the arts was the more or less tacit understanding that manual labor and pursuits which require the use of the hands are beneath the dignity of the intelligent. However this attitude of mind came about, the arts and many of the fine and simple things which made the world a good place in which to live have been lost. In this connection I recall having met some years ago along the shores of Lake Superior a so-called underprivileged Indian boy who was later sent to an arts and crafts school to enable him to overcome his handicaps. Ap-

parently he was far from being underprivileged in natural endowment, for as a result of careful training he was given a scholarship to one of our finest art centers as a prize for a series of paintings. The fact of the matter is, our educators have been unwittingly depriving our best talent of the best training. There is something radically wrong with our Catholic educational outlook. We clamor for a Catholic art, and judging from what they do our educators expect Catholic artists to become artists through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, or the influx of an ichor, which is not ordinary human blood, into their veins.

THE general tenor of the articles in this issue is educational. SISTER HELENE, O.P., who by the way did not want her name to appear as an author, is the writer of "Participation in the Apostolate for Catholic Art." Sister Helene is secretary of the CAA and director of Studio Angelico, Adrian, Michigan.

¶ GRAHAM CAREY, who is very well known to CAQ readers, is the author of "Art and Atheism." Mr. Carey's thesis is not that art is specifically a therapeutical agent for the mentally ill, but that some people are subject to mental aberrations, such, for example, as atheism, because they do not live the normal creative life of active individuals. They are cured because they begin to live the normal life.

"Christian Principles in the Teaching of Art" is by Father Leonard McLean Fee, S.M. Unfortunately we have no further details about him and his work.

¶ "Why Exhibit Works of Art," by DR. COOMARASWAMY, has been chosen precisely because it answers so many of the problems of doubting Thomases in the CAA fold who contest the CAA doctrine that art is for *use*. No art, Dr. Coomaraswamy tells us, was ever created for a museum. The museum is an after-thought.

C.A.A. NEWS

AT the North Central Regional meeting of the Catholic Art Association held April 29 at the College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn., the officers of the CAA met in order to re-outline some of the details of the Constitution. In what was a memorable meeting for the seventy-five members of the CAA who attended from the states of Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, MELVILLE STEINFELS, professional chairman, SISTER HELENE, and ANN GRILL spoke on the work of the CAA in the professional field, our colleges and grade schools. Miss Grill gave an illustrated demonstration of her work in the grade schools of Chicago.

¶ April 26, the Central Region of the CAA met at the College of St. Francis, Joliet, Ill.

¶ Our treasurer, FRANK SEAMAN, has been doing good work in Catholic Art activities this spring and summer. Recently he sent us photos of an interesting "Christ the King" crucifix made by the Springfield Mission Craftsmen for the Chapel of the Sioux Indians in Porcupine, South Dakota. Mr. Seaman has

been promoting the extension of CAA activities to those missions which because of lack of funds or a near-by artist have been unable to decorate their chapels adequately.

¶ Miss Ade de Bethune gave three talks on art April 11, 12, and 13 at Fall River, Athol, and Worchester, Massachusetts. At St. Catherine's Academy, Fall River, on the invitation of Mother Mary Joseph, O.P., an ardent CAA member for many years, she gave an illustrated lecture on stained glass. The following day she again delivered her illustrated lecture on stained glass to the Daughters of Isabella at Athol. Ade's slides were lent to her by Mr. Connick of Boston. All in color, they included ancient illustrations showing medieval glassmen at work; Mr. Connick's men at work on the eight different steps in contemporary glass designing, painting, cutting, and leading; reproductions of medieval glass in England and France, including the famous windows of Chartres Cathedral; and, finally, slides of modern windows, mainly Mr. Connick's own work.

April 13, she spoke to the Catholic Women's club in Worchester on Catholic art, following which she gave a demonstration of wood carving. Among the demonstrations was actual work on a large crucifix she is doing at the present time, and illustrations of other pieces in various stages of completion. Nor did she omit the necessary propaganda for the CAA and the CAQ.

¶ Another feather in the hat of the CAA is the appointment of Miss Ann Grill of Chicago to teach a course in Christian art at the C.Y.O. Sheil School of Social Studies, Chicago.

¶ Melville Steinfels, our professional chairman, in spite of the uncertainties of wartime and the requirements of his clients, has been busy planning an exhibition of Catholic art under Catholic Art Association auspices. It is a big thing still in the making. Eventually if it develops we will inform CAQ readers of details.

¶ Emil Frei is doing an unusual project for a new church in Mexico. He is directing the natives in the construction of their own church windows on location.

¶ Reverend Lawrason Riggs, chaplain of the Newman Club, Yale University, died May 2, 1943. Father Riggs was one of the outstanding workers in the field of Catholic art in America. R.I.P.

¶ The promised index for the first five volumes of the CAQ will be published as soon as the financial situation of the Association will permit.

¶ Once more we ask CAA members to send us notice of CAA news, not omitting what individual members of the association are doing.

DID YOU KNOW—That Dorothy Canfield is a member of the CAA?